

Patent Application No. 09/699,400
Attorney Docket No. 57761.000143

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 20, 2005 has been reviewed and its contents carefully considered.

Claims **63-65, 67, 68 and 71-76** remain pending in the present application. By this amendment, claim **63** is amended and claims **48-61, 69-70, 78-82, 84-88, 90-93, and 95-100** are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter set forth therein. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance.

A. The Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 48-55, 57-61, 63-65, 67-69, 72-76, 78-82, 84-88, 90-93 and 95-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being anticipated by Nierlich (U.S. Patent 6,519,509) in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 6,578,142) and Ambrose (U.S. Patent 6,553,563). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 56 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over such art, and further in view of Eller (U.S. Patent 6,643,555).

Applicant traverses such rejections and respectfully submits that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention (as recited in the noted claims) for the reasons as set forth in the March 24, 2005 Office Action response. Further, it is submitted that the newly cited and applied art to Ambrose and Eller do not cure the deficiencies present in Nierlich and Anderson.

However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended the claims to proceed with the allowable subject matter, as set forth below.

Patent Application No. 09/699,400
Attorney Docket No. 57761.000143

B. The Allowable Subject Matter

On page 9, the Office Action asserts that claim 70 is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, features of claims 69 and 70 have been added to independent claim 63. As a result, Applicant submits that claim 63, and claims dependent thereon, are allowable. The other rejected claims have been canceled, as set forth above

C. Conclusion

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS

James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500

Dated: August 22, 2005